

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/426,011	10/25/1999	MICHAEL SIMONS	BIS-043/CIP 1306	
7	2590 03/06/2006	03/06/2006 EXAMINER		
DAVID PRA	SHKER PC		TELLER	ROY R
P O BOX 5387 MAGNOLIA, MA 01930		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			1654	

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006 -

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/426,011	SIMONS ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Roy Teller	1654			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
	Period for Reply					
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>16 December 2005</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🖂	Claim(s) 11,15 and 16 is/are pending in the ap	plication.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>11, 15 and 16</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers	••				
9) 🗆 .	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce		Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
		•				
Attachment	(s)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)						
	No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:				

This office action is in response to the amendment, received 12/16/05. Claims 1-10 and 12-14 are cancelled.

Claims 11, 15 and 16 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 11, 15 and 16 are/stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for the reasons of record, which are restated below.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a "written description" rejection, rather than an enablement rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurka, 19 USPQ2d 1111, states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention, for purposes of the "written description" inquiry, is

Art Unit: 1654

whatever is now claimed" (see page 1117).

A review of the language of the claim indicates that these claims are drawn to a family of oligopeptides, i.e., the family of PR-39 derived oligopeptides whose members individually cause a selective inhibition of proteasome-mediated degradation for at least one identifiable peptide insitu after introduction intracellularly to a viable cell, each member of said PR-39 derived oligopeptide family; being a peptide not substantially greater than 11 amino acid residues in length; a peptide having a N-terminal amino acid residue sequence which begins with Arg-Arg-Arg; the peptide which is devoid of the amino acid residue sequences Pro-Pro-X-X-Pro-Pro-X-

A description of a genus may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co., 119 F3d 1559, 1569, 43

USPQ2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly (43

USPQ2d 1398-1412), the court held that a generic statement which defines a genus of nucleic acids by only their functional activity does not provide an adequate written description of the genus. The court indicated that, while applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by a genus, the description of the genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of species falling within the scope of the claimed genus. At section B(1), the court states "An adequate written description of a DNA ... requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention".

Art Unit: 1654

There are two species of the claimed genus disclosed that is within the scope of the claimed genus, *i.e.* SEQ ID NO: 4 and SEQ ID NO: 5. The disclosure of a single disclosed species may provide an adequate written description of a genus when the species disclosed is representative of the genus. However, the present claim encompasses numerous species that are not further described. There is substantial variability among the species. The instant claim 11 defines the peptide by function, not structure. The only structure defined is a peptide not substantially greater than 11 amino acid residues in length; a peptide having a N-terminal amino acid residue sequence which begins with Arg-Arg-Arg; the peptide which is devoid of the amino acid residue sequences Pro-Pro-X-X-Pro-Pro-X-X-Pro and Pro-Pro-X-X-Pro-Pro-X-X-Pro where X is any amino acid.

One of skill in the art would not recognize from the disclosure that the applicant was in possession of the family of PR-39 derived oligopeptides whose members individually cause a selective inhibition of proteasome-mediated degradation for at least one identifiable peptide insitu after introduction intracellularly to a viable cell, each member of said PR-39 derived oligopeptide family; being a peptide peptide not substantially greater than 11 amino acid residues in length; a peptide having a N-terminal amino acid residue sequence which begins with Arg-Arg-Arg; the peptide which is devoid of the amino acid residue sequences Pro-Pro-X-X-Pro-Pro-X-X-Pro where X is any amino acid.

The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed" (see *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

All other claims depend directly or indirectly from the rejected claim and are, therefore, also rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph for the reasons set forth above.

Applicant's arguments were carefully considered but were not found persuasive.

Applicant contends that the written description requirement has been complied with and has been sufficiently satisfied by the disclosure. However, the examiner contends that the instant claims do not describe the structure of the peptides claimed in a way that one of ordinary skill could make and use the envisioned invention. The instant specification does not define how different a peptide can be and still be considered a PR-39 derived oligopeptide. While function of the envisioned peptide is defined, the structure remains undefined.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 11, 15 and 16 are/stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross (USPN 6,133,233) for the reasons of record which are restated below.

The instant invention is drawn to disclose a PR-39 derived oligopeptide family whose members individually cause a selective inhibition of proteasome-mediated degradation in-situ after introduction to a viable cell, and each member being an oligopeptide having not substantially greater than 11amino acids residues and having an N-terminal sequence of Arg-Arg. The instant invention provides an in-situ stimulation of angiogenesis. By definition, therefore, both in-vivo and in-vitro circumstances of use and applications are envisioned and expected (see, e.g., for example page 8)

Art Unit: 1654

Ross teaches an in vivo method of reducing reperfusion injury in a mammal which comprise the steps of administering into the mammal's bloodstream an effective amount of proline/arginine rich peptide. Ross discloses SEQ ID NO:4, a 14 amino acid peptide which includes the instant invention's SEQ ID NO: 4 and SEQ ID NO: 5 of the instant application (see, e.g., for example, abstract, column 2, column 9, and claim 2).

From the teachings of the reference, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention.

Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the reference, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Applicant's arguments were carefully considered but were not found persuasive.

Applicant contends that the '233 patent teaches the use of markedly different compositions of matter which are suitable as a class of compounds for effecting a single purpose-reducing reperfusion injury resulting from temporary occlusion of a blood vessel of a living mammal. However, the examiner contends that the '233 patent teaches SEQ ID NO:4, a 14 amino acid peptide which includes the instant invention's SEQ ID NO: 4 and SEQ ID NO: 5 of the instant application, which is not substantially greater than 11amino acids residues and having an N-terminal sequence of Arg-Arg-Arg.

Art Unit: 1654

## Conclusion

## All claims are rejected.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roy Teller whose telephone number is 571-272-0971. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell, can be reached on 571-272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 1654

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RT 1654 3/2/06 RT

> BRUCE R. CAMPELL, PH.D SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Bune Campell

Page 8